

Schary, Claire

From: Schary, Claire
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 3:40 PM
To: Gable, Kelly
Subject: RE: Quick review possible of 2 page fact sheet on regional trading project?

Exemption 5: Attorney-Client PrivilegedExemption 5: Attorney-Client PrivilegedExemption 5: Attorney-Client Privileged
Exemption 5: Attorney-Client PrivilegedExemption 5: Attorney-Client PrivilegedExemption 5: Attorney-Client Privileged
Exemption 5: Attorney-Client Privileged

Non-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-Responsive
Non-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-Responsive
Non-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-Responsive
Non-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-Responsive
Non-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-Responsive
Non-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-ResponsiveNon-Responsive
Non-ResponsiveNon-Responsive

-- Claire

Claire Schary
schary.claire@epa.gov / (206) 553-8514

From: Gable, Kelly
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 3:08 PM
To: Schary, Claire
Cc: Psyk, Christine
Subject: RE: Quick review possible of 2 page fact sheet on regional trading project?

Exemption 5: Attorney-Client PrivilegedExemption 5: Attorney-Client PrivilegedExemption 5: Attorney-Client Privileged

From: Schary, Claire
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 4:09 PM
To: Gable, Kelly
Cc: Psyk, Christine
Subject: Quick review possible of 2 page fact sheet on regional trading project?

Exemption 5: Attorney-Client PrivilegedExemption 5: Attorney-Client PrivilegedExemption 5: Attorney-Client Privileged
Exemption 5: Attorney-Client PrivilegedExemption 5: Attorney-Client PrivilegedExemption 5: Attorney-Client Privileged
Exemption 5: Attorney-Client PrivilegedExemption 5: Attorney-Client PrivilegedExemption 5: Attorney-Client Privileged
Exemption 5: Attorney-Client PrivilegedExemption 5: Attorney-Client Privileged

Exemption 5: Attorney-Client PrivilegedExemption 5: Attorney-Client Privileged

-- Claire

Claire Schary
schary.claire@epa.gov / (206) 553-8514

From: Carrie Sanneman [<mailto:sanneman@willamettepartnership.org>]
Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2013 12:45 PM

To: Schary, Claire
Subject: Re: 2 pager

Thanks Claire, I accepted those changes and all the rest, attached is a clean version.

We are really anxious to get this one out of the review cycle for good. Our intention was that the commenting/editing phase was over and we would send out a final on Friday as an FYI, to be posted shortly after. If you feel strongly that EPA needs another round of review, please coordinate that as soon as you are able and send to me directly.

Thanks
Carrie

On Mon, Jun 10, 2013 at 12:51 PM, Schary, Claire <Schary.Claire@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi Carrie,

I looked through your revised version and it looks good to me, with only two minor changes. One is to include mention of the pilot projects – so look for that addition in the Project Timeline section. The other is in the first sentence in the Project Goal section –the word “ensure” was used twice in that sentence, so I suggest using the phrase “make certain” instead for the second instance.

I’ll hold off sharing it with others at EPA for their feedback until you have the version to send to the whole group.

- -Claire

Claire Schary

schary.claire@epa.gov / (206) 553-8514

From: Carrie Sanneman [mailto:sanneman@willamettepartnership.org]
Sent: Friday, June 07, 2013 11:27 AM
To: Schary, Claire
Subject: 2 pager

Hi Claire,

On revisiting the 2 pager (in hopes of finally checking it off the list), I took a deeper look at your last round of changes and made a few further revisions. Since you have been the most engaged in revisions, I think it might be easiest to make sure you are OK with these before getting it out to the whole group.

Your revisions focused on making clear that states would incorporate JRA best practices into their own programs etc after the JRA process was complete through formal channels that included public comment etc. I think that is important, but you inserted very similar language in three different places, which felt repetitive and made it seem like the adoption and rule-making was definitely going to happen, which I don't think we can promise. I removed the reference in the Project Goals section, but kept those in the Project Overview and Project Timeline sections. Also, I changed the wording from "states will" to "states may" because, again, I am not sure we can be sure they will and I'm worried that we would create the impression this was a pre-rule making process.

Let me know what you think.

Thanks

Carrie